



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/107,524	06/30/1998	PAUL CHAMBERS	PHA-23.406	8175

7590 04/07/2003

North America Corp.  
U S PHILIPS CORPORATION  
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD  
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, FRANCIS N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

25

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/107,524

Applicant(s)

CHAMBERS, PAUL

Examiner

FRANCIS NGUYEN

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed on 2/6/2003 is entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimoto ( US Patent 5,912,710) in view of Sawai et al. ( US Patent 6,252,590)

As to **claim 23**, Fujimoto teaches a method of enabling an image to be displayed on a display monitor (Abstract, column 5, lines 1-7, **monitor** 200, column5, line 24) , wherein

the image is stored on a DVD ( **video data recorded on DVD media** 100, column 5, lines 10-12);

the image as stored has a resolution of 720x480 pixels ( column 5, lines 44-45);

However, Fujimoto fails to expressly teach monitor with display resolution mode 800x600 pixels.

the method comprises:

determining if the monitor has a display resolution mode of 800x600 pixels; and

Art Unit: 2674

if the monitor has the display resolution mode of 800x600 pixels, enabling the image to be displayed on the monitor with an image resolution of  $X \times 480$  pixels, wherein  $X$  is an integer being one of:  $X$  substantially equals 800 and  $X$  substantially equals 852.

Sawai et al. teaches a display resolution mode of 800x600 pixels ( normal mode SVGA as shown in figure 4) and also monitor 2( multimedia capable displaying video images of personal computer, column 5, lines 8-11), Wide-1 mode (848x480)( column 8, lines 1-4, figure 5). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the method taught by Fujimoto then substitute the display monitor 200 with the monitor 2 taught by Sawai et al. since monitor 2 is disclosed as multimedia capable as mentioned above, to obtain the combined method Fujimoto modified by Sawai et al. , because it would result in higher resolution display and also user flexibility to switch resolution. Note that the combined method Fujimoto modified by Sawai et al. uses the monitor of display resolution mode of 800x600 pixels, enabling the image to be displayed on the monitor with an image resolution of 848x480 pixels, wherein 848 is an integer being substantially equals 852. The ground of rejection is maintained.

As to **claim 24**, Fujimoto teaches an image processing system wherein:

the system has a display monitor ( Abstract, column 5, lines 1-7, **monitor 200**, column 5, line 24)

the system is enabled to process an image, stored with a 720x480 image resolution on a DVD (video data recorded on DVD media 100, column 5, lines 10-12) ;

Art Unit: 2674

However, Fujimoto fails to teach computer monitor with at least a display resolution mode of 800x600 pixel, so as to have the monitor display the image with an image resolution of  $X \times 480$  in the display resolution mode of 800x600 pixels; and  $X$  is an integer being one of  $X$  substantially equals 800 and  $X$  substantially equals 852.

Sawai et al. teaches a **display resolution mode of 800x600 pixels** ( normal mode SVGA as shown in figure 4) and also **monitor 2( multimedia capable displaying video images of personal computer, column 5, lines 8-11), Wide-1 mode (848x480)( column 8, lines 1-4, figure 5).** It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the apparatus taught by Fujimoto then substitute the display monitor 200 with the monitor 2 taught by Sawai et al. since monitor 2 is disclosed as multimedia capable as mentioned above, to obtain the combined apparatus Fujimoto modified by Sawai et al. , because it would result in higher resolution display and also user flexibility to switch resolution. Note that the combined apparatus Fujimoto modified by Sawai et al. uses the monitor of display resolution mode of 800x600 pixels, enabling the image to be displayed on the monitor with an image resolution of 848x480 pixels, wherein 848 is an integer being substantially equals 852, as claimed. The ground of rejection is maintained.

As to **claim 25**, note the same citation for claim 24. The system further comprising a DVD player ( see Fujimoto, **DVD media 100** shown in figure 1). The ground of rejection is maintained.

As to **claim 26**, Fujimoto teaches an image processing system (Abstract, column 5, lines 1-7, comprising

Art Unit: 2674

a DVD player (**DVD media 100** shown in figure 1) wherein the DVD player is enabled to determine a pixel format of an image stored on a DVD ( **MPEG program stream read out from DVD media 100 to MPEG2 decoder 102** as shown in figure 1, column 6, lines 15-20) , a , and

a monitor (**monitor 200**, column 5, line 24)

the system is enabled to interrogate the monitor about a display capability ( **display aspect ratio of monitor to be processed by MPEG decoder 102**, as shown on figure 1);

However, Fujimoto fails to expressly teach a computer display monitor with at least a display resolution mode of 800x600 pixels , the system is enabled to process an image, so as to have the monitor display the image with an image resolution of Xx480 in the display resolution of 800x600 pixels; X being substantially equal to one of 800 and 852.

Sawai et al. teaches a **display resolution mode of 800x600 pixels ( normal mode SVGA** as shown in figure 4) and also **monitor 2( multimedia capable displaying video images of personal computer**, column 5, lines 8-11), **Wide-1 mode (848x480)(** column 8, lines 1-4, figure 5). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the apparatus taught by Fujimoto then substitute the display monitor 200 with the monitor 2 taught by Sawai et al. since monitor 2 is disclosed as multimedia capable as mentioned above, to obtain the combined apparatus Fujimoto modified by Sawai et al. , because it would result in higher resolution display and also user flexibility to switch resolution. Note that the combined apparatus Fujimoto modified by Sawai et al. uses the monitor of display resolution mode of 800x600 pixels, enabling the image to be

Art Unit: 2674

**displayed on the monitor with an image resolution of 848x480 pixels, wherein 848 is an integer being substantially equals to 852. The ground of rejection is maintained.**

***Response to Argument***

3. The applicant's argument filed on 2/6/2003 has been considered but is not persuasive. **Applicant's argument as to cited Sawai et al. failing to teach a process of enabling the display of an image on a monitor having a resolution of 800x480 or 852x480 on a monitor having a display resolution of 800x600, is not valid** because said teaching was provided by a combination of references Fujimoto in view of Sawai et al. as described in paragraph 2 above. Note the combined apparatus Fujimoto modified by Sawai et al. uses the monitor of display resolution mode of 800x600 pixels (Sawai et al., figure 4, **monitor 2(multimedia capable displaying video images of personal computer, column 5, lines 8-11)**, enabling the image to be displayed on the monitor with an image resolution of 848x480 pixels (Sawai et al., **Wide-1 mode (848x480)**, column 8, lines 1-4, figure 5), wherein 848 is an integer being substantially equals 852, as claimed. Therefore, the ground of rejection is maintained.

**Applicant's argument as to Sawai et al. failing to teach enabling to display an image having an original resolution of 720x480 as an image with a resolution of 800x480 or 852x480 is not valid** because said teaching was provided by a combination of references Fujimoto in view of Sawai et al. as described in paragraph 2 above. Note the system is enabled to process an image, stored with a 720x480 image resolution on a DVD is taught by Fujimoto (**video data recorded on DVD media 100, column 5, lines 10-12**) whereas Sawai et al. teaches image with resolution 852x480( **Wide-1 mode (848x480)**, column 8, lines 1-4, figure 5).

Art Unit: 2674

Therefore, the ground of rejection for all claims is maintained as explained in paragraph 2 above.

### CONCLUSION

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **FRANCIS N NGUYEN** whose telephone number is **703 308-8858**. The examiner can normally be reached during hours 8:00 AM- 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached at 703 305-4079.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**



Art Unit: 2674

**(703) 872-9314 ( for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor ( Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding  
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service whose telephone number is  
(703) 306-0377.

  
FN

March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2003

FRANCIS N NGUYEN

Examiner

Art Unit 2674



RICHARD HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600